

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-4 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Related Art in view of Kim (US 5,990,492).

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 5 and 6 recite allowable subject matter.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claim 1 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-8 are pending for consideration.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-4 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Related Art in view of Kim (US 5,990,492). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on grounds that Applicants' Related Art fails to teach or suggest the combination of features recited by amended independent claim 1, and hence dependent claims 2-8.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a liquid crystal display panel including, in part, “*a plurality of transparent electrodes along the extension direction of the corresponding conductive line to be overlapped with the conductive line with at least one intermediate film interposed therebetween, each transparent electrode being divided into a plurality of transparent electrode segments isolated from each other in the extension direction of the corresponding conductive line*” (emphasis added). In contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, Applicants' Related Art FIGs. 1-4 fail to teach or suggest transparent electrode structures as recited by amended independent claim 1, and hence dependent claims 2-8.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Kim fails to remedy the deficiencies of Applicants' Related Art FIGs. 1-4, since Kim is completely silent with regard to segmented transparent electrodes.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-4 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Related Art in view of Kim be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 041993-5228
Application No.: 10/669,712
Page 7

time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____


David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Date: February 16, 2007

Customer No. 09629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202-739-3000